



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*District Court of the United States. Northern District of Illinois. In Bankruptcy.*

IN THE MATTER OF FREDERICK JEWETT, BANKRUPT.

Where there are both individual and partnership creditors of a bankrupt, but the assets are individual only, though mainly consisting of goods purchased by the bankrupt from the partnership on its dissolution prior to the bankruptcy, and being principally the same goods in the purchase of which the partnership debts had originated; the partnership creditors will be entitled to be paid *pari passu* with the individual creditors.

THE facts appear in the following certificate of the Register, Hon. LINCOLN CLARK.—This being the day fixed for the second meeting of creditors, the assignee, Mark Kimbell, Esq., made his report by which it appeared that he had in his hands the sum of thirty-seven thousand six hundred and forty-six dollars and eighty-three cents (\$37,646.83) cash as assets subject to distribution, as the creditors or the assignee should determine according to section 27 of the Act of Bankruptcy.

Upon due consideration and in view of what might be necessary to meet future expenses and provide for claims not yet proved, &c., a majority of the creditors being present and declining to decide, the assignee, at their request, decided that twenty-five per cent. of the cash in his hands should be distributed among those creditors who had proved their claims and who were legally entitled to receive a dividend out of the assets of the bankrupt's estate, and that the surplus should remain in his hands subject to future distribution. The said Jewett was forced into bankruptcy under the involuntary provisions of the act at the instance of The Third National Bank of Chicago.

At the time of the adjudication of bankruptcy the said Jewett was a hardware merchant in the city of Chicago, and previous to February 1st 1867, was in copartnership with one Oliver R. Butler for the space of ten years, under the firm and style of Jewett & Butler. On said 1st of February the said Jewett purchased the entire interest of Butler. The entire indebtedness of the bankrupt was more than one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000). The whole amount of the assets, good and doubtful, were estimated at between fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) and

sixty thousand dollars (\$60,000). About eighty-five thousand dollars (\$85,000) of claims were proved by the individual creditors of Jewett, and about sixteen thousand dollars (\$16,000) were proved by the creditors of Jewett & Butler.

The Third National Bank, who instituted the proceeding, were individual and joint creditors.

Upon this state of the proofs Mr. *Clarkson*, attorney for some of the individual creditors, and also for some of the joint creditors, contended that the individual creditors and the joint creditors should be paid *pari passu* out of the assets. Mr. *Waller*, attorney in behalf of some of the individual creditors, contended that the joint creditors could receive no portion of the assets of the bankrupt until the claims of the individual creditors were fully satisfied. There was no evidence of the solvency of Oliver Butler, nor that there were any partnership assets; nor was there any evidence to the contrary, and thereupon the question arose whether the joint creditors were entitled to share equally with the individual creditors in the dividend of assets. The register overruled the objection made by Mr. *Waller*, and decided that all the creditors were entitled to equal distribution, which question, by the agreement of the respective attorneys, is certified to the court for its decision.

In this case the bankrupt is as much bound to pay the debts due and owing by Jewett & Butler as he is to pay his own individual debts.

In fact the debts owing by the partnership are several as well as joint; and the creditors have a right to proceed against any property or interest therein which he has for the satisfaction of their claims; and if there is any principle in equity which qualifies this rule it is not because the obligation of the bankrupt is any less, nor because all his interests in his property are not subject to the payment of his debts; but equity will interfere only to protect the relative rights of others as those rights shall be made to appear. It appears to me, then, that *primâ facie* all the creditors of the bankrupt have the right to proceed against his property for the satisfaction of their debts.

It is undoubtedly a rule in equity that where there are individual creditors and partnership creditors, and individual assets and partnership assets, the individual creditors must resort to the individual assets, and the joint creditors to the partnership assets;

and it is not denied that this rule is applicable in bankruptcy. But how stands the rule when there are separate and joint creditors, but no joint or partnership assets, all the assets being those of the bankrupt? There are exceptions upon this subject: Story on Part., § 378, says: "These exceptions allow a joint creditor to share *pari passu* with the separate creditors in every case to which they are applicable. They are of three sorts: (1.) When the joint creditor is the petitioner for a separate commission against the bankrupt partner. (2.) Where there is no joint estate and no living solvent partner. (3.) Where there are no separate debts." The rule then is that "where there is no joint estate and no living solvent partner," the joint creditors shall share equally with the separate creditors.

How then is the exception to be manifested? Under what circumstances shall it be considered that there is no joint estate and no solvent living partner?

If there was any joint estate the bankrupt was interested in it and he was bound to set it out in his schedule, but he has set forth none. No doubt it would have been competent for the individual creditors to have proved that there was a joint estate and a solvent living partner, but they did not seek to do it, but contended that the individual debts should be first paid although there was no joint estate, and although the individual debts would consume the whole amount of the assets.

Can it be that the joint creditors have no rights against the assets until they allege and prove negative propositions?

In equity where two parties have a lien upon one fund, and one of the parties has a lien also upon a second fund, the party having a lien upon the first fund can compel the other party to exhaust his remedy upon the second fund before he can resort to the first.

But must he not allege and prove the existence of the second fund?

I suppose it is clear that he must.

How does the statement of facts and the proof in the foregoing case differ?

There is a view of the subject which would render it exceedingly unjust that the joint creditors should be postponed to the individual creditors.

The testimony of Jewett was taken in his deposition. He

proves, that, after he bought out the interest of his partner, he purchased but few goods; of course the debts of the joint creditors were made in the sale to the firm of Jewett & Butler of the goods which constituted chiefly the assets of Jewett.

Should these goods be turned away from the payment of the joint debts, which constituted the consideration for making them, to the payment of the individual debts?

“Equity alone can restrain the joint creditors from receiving their full dividend until the joint effects are exhausted.” See James on Bankruptcy 91.

I am of the opinion, in the present state of the proofs, that the joint creditors should be paid *pari passu* with the individual creditors.

DRUMMOND, J.—As there seems to be no joint fund or source of payment for the joint creditors, I think the decision of the Register is right.

---

*District Court of the United States. Northern District of Illinois. In Bankruptcy.*

IN THE MATTER OF FREDERICK JEWETT.

Where A., one of two partners, sells his interest in the concern to his copartner, B., taking his notes therefor, and B. becomes bankrupt, leaving some of the notes unpaid, A. cannot receive a dividend from the assignee until all the partnership debts have been paid.

THE facts are set forth in the following certificate of the Register, Hon. LINCOLN CLARK.—This being the day fixed for the second meeting of creditors at the office of the Register for the purpose of hearing the assignee's report, and for declaring a dividend of assets among those entitled thereto, Oliver R. Butler claimed a dividend as creditor of the bankrupt, upon a proof of claims heretofore filed in the sum of ten thousand two hundred and fifteen dollars and forty-three cents (\$10,215  $\frac{43}{100}$ ).

The proofs consist of twelve promissory notes, each for the sum of \$750, made by the said Jewett to the said Butler, dated February 1st 1867, payable the 1st of May 1868, and on the 1st of each and every month thereafter until the whole should be paid.